

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application, with Claims 1 and 14 being independent claims.

It is gratefully acknowledged that Claims 10 and 12 remain objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 14-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kang (U.S. Pat. No. 7,133,691).

Claims 3 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang in view Hyon (U.S. Pat. No. 6,409,112).

Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kang in view Nagai et al. (EP 1383324 A1).

Claims 1 and 14 are amended. No new subject matter is presented.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Examiner states that Kang anticipates each and every limitation of the claim. Amended Claim 1 teaches, in part, a camera lens unit in a portable wireless terminal including a main body and a folder rotatable about a first axis with respect to the main body, the camera lens unit comprising a *camera holder rotating about a hinge axis being identical to the first axis*.

Kang discloses a camera lens unit in a portable wireless terminal including a main body 10 and a folder 20 rotatable about a first axis A with respect to the main body 10 (FIGs. 4-5), the camera lens unit comprising a camera holder 30 rotating about a hinge axis B (FIGs. 4-5). Kang asserts that "it is desirable for the folder 20 and camera module 30 to have two different alignments of rotation axes" (col. 4 lines 1-3). Kang further emphasizes the rotation axis of the folder 20 being different to the rotation axis of the camera module 30 (col. 2 lines 24-26, and independent Claims 1 and 14). By contrast, the camera holder 105 of the present

application rotates about a hinge axis A identical to the first axis A of the folder 102 (FIGs. 1-2). Kang fails to disclose the limitation of *a camera holder rotating about a hinge axis being identical to the first axis* taught by Amended Claim 1.

Clearly, Amended Claim 1 structurally differs from Kang.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the above rationale for Amended Claim 1 also similarly applies to Amended Claim 14 with respect to Kang.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims herein, namely Claims 1-18, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant

**The Farrell Law Firm**  
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard, Suite 701  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
(516) 228-3565 - Tel  
(516) 228-8475 - Fax

PJF/DGL/mk